

STAT

3

ARTICLE APPEARED  
ON PAGE 2-10CHICAGO TRIBUNE  
24 APRIL 1982

## Tinker, tailor, sailor, turf

Like everything else in the shadow world of espionage, the resignation of Adm. Bobby R. Inman as the number two man in the Central Intelligence Agency bears a number of interpretations. The worst case evaluation is that his aggressive resistance to proposals to unleash the agency in domestic cases brought him into disfavor with the White House and made him quit in frustration. The face the administration puts on it is that Adm. Inman has children to put through college and wants to go into the private sector to make the money to do it.

There has been an ongoing battle within the intelligence community over the mission of the CIA, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other agencies. This is partly no more than a conventional turf fight over which agency gets the lead in domestic counterintelligence cases, with the FBI trying to defend its traditional domain against the CIA. But it also has more significant implications, because by training, discipline and Department of Justice supervision, the FBI is more familiar and comfortable than the CIA is with the restraints imposed by the Constitution.

Adm. Inman on occasion took the nonparochial view that the CIA should not become deeply involved in the sensitive area of domestic counterintelligence investigations. Indeed, his opposition was probably the most important factor in the scuttling of a plan to make sweeping revisions in the functions of the counterintelligence agencies.

It has been reported that Adm. Inman also objected to a recent administration review of

counterintelligence policy and organization and that, though he ultimately succeeded in preventing any radical change, he spent all his bureaucratic capital doing so and had to resign.

Adm. Inman took these positions not because he wanted to become a liberal folk hero, but for a very hardnosed reason. He understood the danger to the agency of becoming embroiled in investigations within the United States. He understood the reasons for separating the functions of the FBI and the CIA and for drawing up written rules governing the conduct of investigations at home and abroad. They protect the agencies from the consequences of changing public opinion about the importance and ethical implications of spying without impeding vital intelligence operations. Neither agency can well afford to go through another period of bloodletting like the one they went through in the late 1970s, when decades of questionable secret activities became public in a matter of months and the knives were out to find a villain. Nor can the country as a whole

For this reason, Adm. Inman's resignation is a loss, no matter which explanation one accepts. He was a strong-minded intelligence professional who understood better than partisan newcomers that a national intelligence policy, like the foreign policy it is supposed to support, must be designed to create a lasting consensus. And since the details must be kept secret, the structural safeguards against abuse that have so nettled some within the administration are the very foundation of continued public support.